

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**

124



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,797	10/19/2001	Jen-Hwang Weng	BHT-3167-22	6951
7590 08/20/2004			EXAMINER	
DOUGHERTY & TROXELL 5205 LEESBURG PIKE, SUITE 1404 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/981,797	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WENG, JEN-HWANG	
	<b>Examiner</b> Laurie Ries	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Page 1, line 14 – “and helps” – should read and “online help” or “user assistance”, etc
- Page 1, line 15 – “intimate feeling” - the intended meaning is unclear
- Page 2, line 12 – “publishers have little” should read “publishers have had little”
- Page 2, line 26 – “entering” should read “to enter” and “editing” should read “to edit”
- Page 2, lines 32 – “inserting” should read “inserted”
- Page 4, lines 8, 18, and 21 – “users’ ends” should read “end users”
- Page 4, line 31 – “and accepts” should read “and the system accepts”
- Page 5, lines 28 and 30 – “inserting” should read “inserted”
- Page 6, line 18 – “for adding a deletion line” – the intended meaning is unclear

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- As per claim 1, “user end” on line 6 should read “end user”.
- As per claim 2, “inserting” on line 16 should read “inserted”.
- As per claim 4, “user ends” on line 23 should read “end users”.
- As per claim 5, “inserting” on line 29 should read “inserted”
- As per claim 9, “inserting” on line 18 should read “inserted”
- As per claim 13, “user ends” on line 32 should read “end users”

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The term “reading records” is not clearly defined within the specification in such a manner as to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to make and/or use the invention.

The remaining dependent claims are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of the base claim(s) from which they depend.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraus (U.S. Patent 6,154,757) further in view of Ohi (U.S. Patent 6,529,943 B1).

As per claims 1 and 8, Krause discloses a method and system for providing online web page reading records allowing a number of users through a network, or communication link, to display a web page and related reading records to the end user via a network or communication link where the related reading records are distinguished by the user's identification data, or user's defined parameter values. (See Krause, Column 6, lines 35-65). Krause discloses the inclusion of a server, a means for storing data, and a means for storing a coding means for executing the described method. (See Krause, Figure 1, Column 5, lines 65-67, and Column 6, lines 1-29). Krause also discloses that the method also provides a number of reading record functions to be implemented on a web page. (See Krause, Column 6, lines 56-60). Krause also discloses that this method also includes receiving reading records entered

Art Unit: 2176

by the users through the reading records function on the web page and instantly displays the reading records on the web page. (See Krause, Column 7, lines 7-15). Krause also discloses storing the user parameters, or related reading records. (See Krause, Column 9, lines 10-24). Krause does not disclose expressly storing the user's identification information. Ohi discloses that user identification information is stored in memory. (See Ohi, Column 14, lines 56-60). Krause and Ohi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the storage of user identification information of Ohi with the method for providing web page reading records of Krause. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify the user in order to send the page data to that user at a later date or time. (See Ohi, Column 14, lines 48-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohi with Krause for the benefit of providing the stored information to the user at a later date or time to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 8.

As per claims 2 and 9, Krause and Ohi disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 8 as described above. Krause also discloses allowing the users to insert a web page object on the web page and have the inserted objects immediately displayed on the web page. (See Krause, Column 16, lines 57-67, and Column 17, lines 1-7)

As per claims 3 and 10, Krause and Ohi disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 8 as described above. Krause also discloses providing functionality required for the users to change format attributes or the characteristics of the

Art Unit: 2176

display of selected visible objects on the web page and have the changed format immediately displayed on the web page. (See Krause, Column 30, lines 19-27).

As per claims 4 and 13, Krause and Ohi disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 8 as described above. Krause also discloses including a multimedia broadcasting function which is downloadable to the end user and which accepts a link to the multimedia object inserted by the user, where the contents of the multimedia object are broadcast to the user. (See Krause, Column 17, lines 1-7).

As per claims 5 and 11, Krause and Ohi disclose the limitations of claims 2 and 9 as described above. Krause also discloses that the inserted object can be text, audio, video, motion picture, or still picture, all of which are included in the list of possible objects set forth in claim 5. (See Krause, Column 17, lines 4-7).

As per claims 6 and 12, Krause and Ohi disclose the limitations of claims 3 and 10 as described above. Krause also discloses that the formatting change can include underlining selected text, which is included in the list of possible formatting options set forth in claim 6. (See Krause, Column 19, lines 55-67, and Column 20, lines 1-3).

As per claims 7 and 14, Krause and Ohi disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 8 as described above. Krause also discloses that the web page can contain government documents, such as the United States Constitution, as shown by Krause, Figure 4.

### ***Conclusion***



Art Unit: 2176

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Kelley (U.S. Patent 6,209,007 B1) discloses a process for creating a customized web page containing information from other web pages accessible by a client computer from an inter- or intra-net.
- Hennings (U.S. Patent 6,763,496 B1) discloses a method for promoting contextual information to display pages containing hyperlinks

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is currently (703) 605-1238. After mid-October, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LAR

  
JOSEPH H. FEILD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER